DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 094 SO 015 020

AUTHOR Bilhartz, Terry David
TITLE Good History vs. Bad History: The Changing Art of Book Reviewing.
PUB DATE 6 Apr 83
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Organization of American Historians (Cincinnati, OH, April 6, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Book Reviews; Comparative Analysis; *Content Analysis; *Historiography; Social Science Research; Tables (Data); Trend Analysis; *United States History

ABSTRACT

A content analysis of 560 book reviews published in the "Journal of American History" over the past 30 years reveals changes in the criteria scholars use when evaluating works on history. Data were collected for several categories and then analyzed by computer. The paper begins with a discussion of distinguishing characteristics of reviews for each of the recent decades: (1) reviewers of the 1950's were less concerned with the scholastic contribution of the work and more concerned with its readability and narrative excitement; (2) 1960's reviewers devoted more space to critiquing rather than summarizing the book; (3) by the 1970's histories applying social science methods received high praise, and boldness in interpretation was lauded; (4) current reviewers expect histories to have a sharply focused and well-analyzed thesis. Reviews are then examined according to topic (military, political, and nonsocial histories); historic period (Gilded Age, early national, middle, Civil War, and modern eras), and genre (monographs and biographies). Next, the reviews are examined according to whether the reviewers were Senior scholars (born before 1900), Progressive Age historians (born 1900 to 1920), Depression historians (born 1920 to 1940), or Recent historians (born since 1940). The dates of both the reviewer's birth and the author's birth are also compared. Finally, the publisher and price of a book is compared to the kind of review it received, and the proportion of male to female reviewers is considered. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235094

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry David Bilhartz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GOOD HISTORY VS. BAD HISTORY: THE CHANGING ART OF BOOK REVIEWING

Paper delivered at a meeting of the
Organization of American Historians
Cincinnati, April 6, 1983

By Terry David Bilhartz

SP 015 020

GOOD HISTORY VS. BAD HISTORY:
THE CHANGING ART OF BOOK REVIEWING

Perhaps no question is more fundamental to our profession than the query, "what distinguishes good history from bad history?" Yet to my knowledge, few have studied systematically how academicians, past and present, have answered this question. What criteria do scholars use to assess "good history"; how has the criteria shifted over the past several decades; and in what ways do changes in evaluative preferences reflect changes within the historical profession?

A personal anecdote will explain my curiosity and illustrate the relevancy of investigating the art of book reviewing. Recently I received two reviews on a manuscript. One reviewer called the work on American religion "innovative" and specifically applauded its originality in method. The second reviewer labeled the work "old fashioned" history and concluded it lacked contemporary significance because it was not grounded in an anthropological model of religious development. Though reaching different conclusions, both reviewers sensed and endorsed an undercurrent of change in the practice of writing history. They disagreed only in that one praised the work as a book of the future, while the other condemned it as a work of the

past. These divergent opinions stimulated me to think seriously about how each reviewer arrived at his conclusion. What does constitute good history today, how does this compare with what was considered good history a generation ago, and what can we expect to be the components of good history in the near future? Probing these questions, I believe, will illuminate some recent changes within the profession and perhaps prove useful to contemporary reviewers and aspiring authors.

To assess the changing (or perhaps changeless) art of book reviewing, I devised a content analysis of book reviews published in the Journal of American History (formerly the Mississippi Valley Historical Review) over the past thirty years. My method was simple and systematic. First, I selected at random a sample of eighty reviews in each of seven two-year periods. For instance, I selected eighty reviews published in 1951/52, eighty in 1956/57, and so on through the years 1981/82. Secondly, using a standardized work sheet, I examined the 560 reviews, specifically probing each one for comments, both pro and con, about some two dozen evaluative categories.[1] I also ascertained descriptive and bibliographic information concerning the book reviewed (its type, subject, publisher, length, and cost) as well as biographical data on each of the reviewers and authors involved.[2]

Thirdly, I coded the data, entered it on a computer terminal, and used the SCSS programs to assist me in analyzing the information. I confess that in doing the analyses, I discovered many more uses of the data than originally envisioned. In this paper I will report and interpret some of the trends uncovered: first, by describing the distinguishing characteristics of reviews for each of the recent decades; second, by noting variations to these norms dependent upon such factors as subject, period, age, and sex; and finally by speculating on the utility and limitations in using the book review as a primary historical source.

How have book reviews changed over the last thirty years? In the 1950s, reviewers expressed greater concern for the appearance of the book than did reviewers of subsequent decades.[3] It was more common then for critics to discuss the quality of the binding and the attractiveness of the cover, layout, and design.[4] Reviewers also were more persnickety about the quality and location of the notes. Many bitterly complained when the notes appeared at the end of the book rather than at the bottom of the page.[5] In comparison with more recent reviewers, the reviewers of the fifties were less concerned with the scholastic contribution of the work and more concerned with its readability and narrative excitement.[6] History in the

fifties was meant to be enjoyed, and the best histories were as entertaining as they were informing. On the whole, this was an era for friendly and uncritical reviews. In fact, the majority of the reviewers devoted over two-thirds of the allotted space to summarizing the book rather than critiquing its argument. And in the critical passages, most reviewers identified the work as favorable with only minor quibbles.[7] In book reviewing as in the culture at large, this was an age of unexpressed opinion. The organizational man did not make enemies.

In the early sixties the era of the "gentlemanly reviews" came to an end. Reviewers increasingly devoted more space to critiquing rather than simply summarizing the book's content.[8] Beginning in the sixties reviewers also became less generous in their overall assessments. To illustrate, in the fifties, sixty-one percent of the books reviewed received favorable ratings. Since 1960, however, this percentage has dropped significantly to only fifty-four percent.[9]

Accompanying the changes in overall assessment were changes in the types of criticisms most often rendered. The earlier emphasis on the attractiveness of the book and on the location of the notes ended. Of rising importance to reviewers of the sixties was the quality and depth of the research.[10] The best histories of the sixties were

books painstakingly grounded in primary sources. Reviewers also expressed an increasing concern with the literary style of the authors. The heightened use of this evaluative category stemmed largely from a rise in the number of complaints about the style.[11] Apparently many reviewers feared that the authors of the sixties were not living up to the literary standards of the previous decade or decades.

By the 1970s the historian had entered the world of the social scientist. Histories utilizing the methods and models of other disciplines (particularly sociology, psychology and political science) received high praise. Boldness in interpretation was rewarded. To a greater degree than before, reviewers took a strong interest in originality of method.[12] At the same time they became less concerned with the traditional historical staples of copious research and factual accuracy.[13] Despite the noted controversy surrounding the classic Time On a Cross, my sample of reviews suggests that this was a decade when reviewers gave glowing and generally uncritical appraisals of "quantitative" histories.[14] The earlier complaints over literary style disappeared as either reviewers found less to complain about, or more likely, they became less interested in the craft of writing. Also conspicuously missing was the fifties-emphasis on history as entertainment.[15]

The best histories of the seventies, if less thoroughly researched, documented, and entertaining, were more original, technical, and thought-provoking.

The trends of the seventies have continued into the eighties with minor variations. While originality in method remains important, the early glamour of quantification has faded. Today's more sophisticated reviewers are as apt to criticize the misuse of statistical procedures as they are to applaud them.[16] It is not originality per se, but analysis which is the watchword of the contemporary review. More than in any previous decade, reviewers today expect histories to have a sharply focused and well-analyzed thesis.[17] The term "narrative" almost has taken a pejorative connotation. Unfortunately, most books do not meet the current standards for analysis. Three reviewers complain about the lack of a well-analyzed thesis for every one who praises a well-developed one. Finally, the preferred length for a history monograph recently has changed. Before 1975, critics who complained about the size of a book generally felt the work was too short. More generally today when the complaint is made, the book is considered too long.[18]

Among the two dozen evaluative categories examined in this study, a few have remained static over time. For example, in every decade about one in four reviewers

commented on the objectivity of the author. Generally these comments were criticisms of the author being too laudatory in his opinion of his subject. Likewise, there was little change in the number of times reviewers reported editing problems such as misspellings or typos. Reviewers also did not fluctuate in their evaluations of significant contributions. While contemporary reviewers more often rate the contribution of a book than reviewers of a generation ago, today as in the 1950s book critics label about four in ten works as notable contributions and about one in eight as the "definitive" history or the best work of its kind. Let us remember, however, that these examples are the exceptions to the rule. The analysis suggests considerable fluctuation over time in the usage of many evaluative categories, as well as changes in standards or levels of expectation of the reviewers.[19] It seems that the norm has been change, not continuity, in the manner in which we judge history.

The composite reviews for each decade varied widely, but often the variance was along statistically observable lines. Books on certain subjects, for instance, were more likely to be critiqued according to a given criteria and standard than were works on other topics.[20] The evidence in this study suggests that military histories generally received lower overall assessments than works on other

subjects. Likewise, political histories often rated below average, largely because many reviewers considered political historians biased in their presentation of the facts.[21] In addition, at least since the mid-1950s, diplomatic histories received less favorable reviews. The major criticisms charged to diplomatic authors were that they lacked originality and rarely added significantly to the preexistent knowledge of the field.[22] In contrast, reviewers were more likely to praise social histories for being more deftly researched, more innovative, and more interesting than non-social histories.[23] The sample sizes for the categories of urban, economic, and intellectual histories were too small to speculate with confidence about trends in these areas. But it appears by their higher than average overall assessments that reviewers were more likely to rate books in these fields above those in the more traditional categories. Not all of the more recently popular fields, however, received such favorable ratings. In fact, the category of "women and minority" history received lower overall assessments than any other thematic category. While the ratings for this category most recently improved, reviewers before 1980 frequently condemned women and minority histories for a lack of critical analysis.[24]

A breakdown of the books into their historic periods exposed several additional variations.[25] For instance,

reviewers gave relatively higher ratings to books on the Gilded Age. Critics generally considered these books better researched and more interesting than works on other periods.[26] Also highly regarded were histories on the Early National, Middle, and Civil War/Reconstruction eras. The praise for Civil War books, however, was not uniform, for those works reviewed between 1961 and 1967 received comparatively weaker reviews.[27] Apparently the centennial Civil War histories failed to meet the normal standards of the field. As a rule, books on nineteenth century America fared better than books on other eras of American history.

In contrast, books on Revolutionary America received lower overall evaluations.[28] Several reviewers criticized Revolutionary texts for being obscurely written. Perhaps more importantly, an unusually high proportion of reviewers of Revolutionary works commented that they disagreed with the author's interpretation of the facts.[29] It appears that controversial subjects, that is, topics imbued with considerable historiographic debate, often received lower assessments. If true, this also would help explain the low evaluations for the thematic category of political history.

The only historic period more negatively ranked than the Revolutionary era was the period 1945 to the Present.[30] Perhaps again it was the controversies surrounding such

issues as the origins of the Cold War or the conflict in Vietnam which contributed to the lower overall assessment of this era. Reviewers also blasted authors of books on modern America for insufficient research.[31] Apparently that is the price one must pay for daring to write about only yesterday.

The genre of publication also had a minor effect on how the book was reviewed. Before 1970 reviewers generally believed biographies offered more to the field of scholarship than historical monographs. After 1970, however, monographs have received at least equal praise.[32] In all decades, however, the multi-authored reader received lower overall assessments than either monographs or biographies.[33] Several reviewers even stated a wish that the festcrift did not exist. These reviewers generally concluded that the articles in such volumes often were insignificant, and almost inevitably of uneven quality.

Another factor influencing the outcome of the review was the year of birth of the reviewer. For analytical purposes I divided the reviewers into four categories: 1) Senior scholars (born before 1900); 2) Progressive Age historians (born 1900 to 1920); 3) Depression historians (born 1920 to 1940); and 4) Recent historians (born since 1940). I then examined the characteristics of the reviews of each group in order to test how historians of different

eras varied in their assessments of "good" history. The results of the analysis paralleled some of the earlier findings. I found that the more recent the era of the reviewer's birth, the more likely he was to express concern for originality in method and subject and for a focused and well-analyzed thesis. He also was less likely to comment on the quality of the notes and illustrations and on the attractiveness of the layout and design.[34] More significantly, the more recent the era of the reviewer's birth, the less likely the reviewer gave a favorable review.[35] Hence, the era of birth, or more appropriately the era of schooling, significantly affected the type of review rendered. This variable, however, did not explain all the changes in reviewing patterns of the past thirty years. For instance, even the Senior historians who in every decade gave the most generous reviews, grew increasingly more stingy in their praise. In short, the trend toward lower reviews remained significant even when adjusted for the reviewer's date of birth.[36] What was learned in graduate school set the parameters, but it did not dictate how history was critiqued throughout one's career.

Several other variations appeared when the author's birth as well as the reviewer's birth was considered. Reviewers of all eras agreed that authors born before

1920 produced more entertaining books.[37] Even more intriguing were the minor variations rooted in the era differences between author and reviewer. My test was to determine how reviewers of one era evaluated authors born in another? Or, to what degree did reviewers critique authors a generation older or younger differently than they critiqued their contemporaries?

Senior historians born before 1900 gave high ratings to books written by other Senior historians and Progressive authors, but comparatively lower reviews to authors born since 1920.[38] Apparently the Senior scholars were neither content with the overall direction of modern scholarship, nor optimistic about the promise of better histories in the near future.

The Progressive historians, however, were less pessimistic. Back in the fifties, Progressive reviewers judged authors their own age more harshly than they did authors born a generation earlier or later. By the mid-sixties, the Progressives mellowed in criticisms toward their contemporaries. Even still, Progressive reviewers on the whole gave more favorable overall assessments to books written by their younger peers than to those written by contemporary or older authors.[39]

Depression historians differed from their elders on several counts. First, as a group the Depression historians

did not follow the general trend toward increasingly lower overall reviews. In fact, Depression reviewers rated books published since 1975 significantly higher than works published in the sixties and early seventies.[40] According to the Depression reviewers, the sixties and early seventies, not the present, marked the low-tide period for the publication of good history. Secondly, the Depression reviewers, unlike the Progressives, rated books written by their contemporaries higher than works written by older or younger authors.[41] Depression reviewers generally were pleased with the current drift of scholarship, though they remained unimpressed by the contributions of authors under forty years of age.

Finally, Recent reviewers, while less likely to praise authors of any era, gave relatively more friendly reviews toward authors born before 1920. They also reserved their most vicious attacks to authors of their own age.[42]

A minor correlation also existed between the era of the reviewer's birth and his preferences toward monographs and biographies. For example, the Progressives and Recent reviewers generally awarded better ratings to biographies than monographs. Depression reviewers, on the other hand, preferred the monograph over the biography.[43] The similarity in judgments between the Progressives and Recent reviewers also carried into other areas. Progressive reviewers

gave higher ratings to recent authors than to authors of other eras, while recent reviewers generally reserved their highest ratings for Progressive authors. Both groups also showed less interest in originality of method and the unity of thesis than did Depression reviewers.[44] In sum, recent history graduates often reflected attitudes about history which were more popular among scholars trained in the Progressive Era than among those educated in the years between the wars.

A fourth factor influencing how a book was reviewed was the reviewer's age at the time of publication. For some of the categories, this factor was a stronger predictor of how a book was reviewed than the variables year of review, subject, or era of the reviewer's birth. The analysis demonstrated that historians at certain stages in their careers expressed greater concerns with particular aspects of a book than did historians of other ages. Likewise, reviewers at one age were more likely to give favorable or unfavorable reviews than were their younger or elder colleagues.

What were the distinguishing traits of reviews written by historians of different age groupings? Reviewers under 35 years of age devoted significantly more space in the review to critiquing a work than did older reviewers. This group closest to their graduate school days also

were more likely to point out factual inaccuracies and critique the quality of the analysis. Younger reviewers also commented more frequently about the originality of the subject and on the author's literary style. The Under 35 reviewer gave average overall assessments.[45]

In contrast, reviewers in the 35 to 45 age bracket offered lower overall assessments than reviewers in other age brackets. This tendency appeared in every decade of the study. In short, historians 35 to 45 years old, most likely recently tenured professors with aspirations to move upwardly in the profession, looked at works with a more critical eye than other reviewers. This group placed an unusually high priority on originality, both in subject and method, and on the quality of the analysis.[46]

Mid-career reviewers in the 45 to 55 age bracket, while mellowing toward average rather than under average overall assessments, tended to devote more space to summary than critique. At mid-career, reviewers also were less concerned than younger historians with the traditional fundamentals of factual accuracy and the quality of the research.[47]

Historians approaching retirement in the 55 to 65 age bracket awarded higher overall assessments than their

younger colleagues. In comparison with those in other age groupings, historians in this bracket placed less emphasis on analysis, research, and clarity and more on the attractiveness of the illustrations and maps. Established reviewers also were less likely to point out major omissions in the sources than were the younger reviewers.[48]

Reviewers over 65 years followed many of the patterns of their immediate younger colleagues. For example, they gave more favorable reviews, and were less rigorous in their demand for analysis. The elder reviewers also expressed more concern with the bias of the author than did younger reviewers.[49]

As a rule, the age of the author did not affect the reviewer profile of the various age brackets. It was only when the age difference between author and reviewer exceeded fifteen years that the author's age became a significant factor. Reviewers fifteen or more years older than authors awarded considerably more favorable reviews.[50] Older reviewers also often praised younger authors for the completeness of their research. The reverse was not true, for young reviewers reserved their harshest reviews for authors fifteen or more years their senior. In the last ten years, the tendency of younger reviewers to blast their elders has diminished. Today the author's age becomes a significant factor in the overall assessment

only when the reviewer is considerably older than the author.[50]

Interestingly, the age of the author in itself, without regard to the age of the reviewer, was a significant factor only in the assessment of research. Reviewers of all ages, in all decades generally agreed that the older the author, the less likely the book was to have been adequately researched.[51] This did not necessarily adversely affect the overall assessment of the book. Apparently the wisdom of older authors enabled them to cut corners without suffering the normal consequences.

Low degree correlations also existed between the review type and the academic institution of the reviewer. Reviewers from large state universities and prestigious private schools generally gave more critical and lower evaluations than other reviewers.[52] Assessments varied, but not significantly according to the state of the reviewer's institution.[53] Since I see no simple explanation for this phenomenon, I will beg the issue and leave it as only fascinating trivia. As a rule, the region of the reviewer's institution only had a marginal effect on how the book was reviewed. It is probable that reviewers from the southwest gave slightly inflated assessments, while mid-westerners were the most generous in labeling a work as a noteworthy contribution. These trends, however, were weak and inconsequential in comparison with other

variables.[54] For the most part, while the art of book reviewing changed and varied considerably according to the subject of the book and the age and era of the reviewer, it was still a national craft with little regional variation.

Reviewers also did not consider all presses equal. University presses, both large and small, rated higher than either major or minor commercial presses.[55] Certain individual presses consistently received high reviews, while others rated very poorly. Because of the small sample size for each press, I will omit the ranking of individual presses in this paper. Such trivia, however, does make for interesting shop-talk, and I will be glad to continue the discussion with interested parties after the session. Finally, if press was a significant factor in predicting the assessment of a book, the price of the book was not. After adjusting book prices to 1967 dollars, I found no correlation between price and assessment.[56] Apparently you don't necessarily get what you pay for.

This analysis also identified trends in the types of historical works published, and in the characteristics of published authors and reviewers. For instance, according to my sample, military histories enjoyed greater popularity in the fifties than in subsequent decades. In the past fifteen years the proportion of political histories declined while the number of urban, religious, and women and minority

histories skyrocketed. Interestingly, there was little correlation between the historic periods of a text and the date of publication.[57] These trends suggest that historic subjects often are fadish--in one season and out the next. Historic time periods, however, are less prone to sudden change. Apparently there will always be room for say another book on the Early National Period, though to be published and reviewed it may have to be about the impact of religion on the lives of urban, Afro-American women.

Second, who published the histories and who reviewed them? The age span of the authors varied widely, ranging from those in their twenties to one in his nineties. The trend, however, has been toward increasingly older authors.[58] In the fifties the average age of an author was 46 to 47 years; today the mean age is nearly 51 years. The age at publication also varied with the subject and press of the book. For instance, Revolutionary authors generally were older, and Gilded Age scholars younger than specialists in other fields. Biographers also were slightly older than writers of monographs, though they were not as old as editors of multi-authored readers. In addition, authors from major commercial presses were on an average nine years older than historians publishing with major university presses.[59] In contrast, there has

been no change in the age span or the mean age of reviewers. In the 1950s as the 1980s, some 85% of the reviewers (as opposed to only 70% of the authors) fell between the ages of 35 to 65. Throughout the period, the mean age among reviewers has remained between 47 and 48 years. Before 1965, most reviewers taught in large state or prestigious private universities. Only in the past fifteen years have professors from smaller state and liberal arts colleges joined the ranks of frequent reviewers. The age of the reviewer was not related to his era of specialization, though as a rule reviewers of political histories came from a pool of younger historians.[60]

Changes in the number of female authors and reviewers in the sample reflected other trends in the profession. In the fifties, about 10% of the works reviewed had female authors. This percentage declined slightly in the sixties and early seventies, but has rebounded most recently to nearly 15%. Before 1975, however, female reviewers were almost non-existent. In the mid-seventies, the proportion of female reviewers rose to a modest 5%, and today it stands at about 10%, still below the percentage of female authors.[61] These figures, along with the previously mentioned statistics on the reviewers' ages and institutions, suggest that until recently the task of book reviewing, at least in the Journal, fell primarily to mid-career males from large, prestigious institutions. In short, the pool from

which reviewers were drawn was more narrowly based than the marketplace. Even today, the percentage of females reviewing subjects other than women's history remains remarkably low. Though the era of gentlemanly reviews ended with the fifties, twenty years later the history profession remains dominated by gentleman reviewers.

Before concluding, let me point out several limitations inherent in the method of this study. First, while the analysis can identify trends toward more critical, less favorable reviews, it remains for the interpreter to decide if this resulted from rising standards or declining quality. My assumption has been that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Hence, I generally have reported fluctuations as changes in reviewing attitudes rather than in the quality of the history product. Others, however, may draw different conclusions. Secondly, this analysis is essentially an external examination of a dead organism--the published review. I have not, and this approach cannot, analyze the internal influences affecting the art of book reviewing. To what extent, for instance, do book review editors influence the outcome of a review by their selection of a reviewer, by their policy statements about what reviews should include, by their casual off-the-record comments to the reviewer before the critique is written, or by their final editing of the completed review. My commentators, of course,

understand the internal dynamics of the reviewing process better than I do. Perhaps they will comment, if such comment is warranted, on the nature of their work and the extent of their influence upon the content of the published review.

Finally, the temptation is too great not to conclude without some friendly, and nonsensical words of advice. If you are a 50 year old intellectual historian with a 372 page manuscript on late nineteenth century America, I encourage you to have it published immediately by a large university press, preferably Princeton University Press. If you could then arrange for it to be reviewed by a 66 year old male professor from a small liberal arts college in Texas, then you can't miss. Your work will be a hit. If, however, you are a 61 year old political historian with a 323 page bicentennial history on the military campaigns leading to the Peace of Paris, and if you plan for your magnum opus to be published by a small commercial press and then reviewed by a 35 year old female assistant professor from the University of Kentucky, I wish you my condolences. Your book should go down in history as the single most negatively reviewed text in the history of the Journal. Now since neither Mr. Selby, nor Mr. McClellan nor Mr. Kutler have yet reached that golden age for favorable reviews, and since all three

come from institutions notorious for producing cut-throat reviewers, I must now sit as a man on death row awaiting his imminent execution. In seriousness, it is a pleasure to be in this session, and I look forward to hearing your responses.

ENDNOTES

[1]See Appendix I. The complete data file and SCSS masterfile are on tape and available for re-analysis at the Sam Houston State University, Computer Center Library.

[2]The source for the birthdates was Miranda C. Herbert and Barbara McNeil, editors. Biography and Genealogy Master Index, 8 volumes (Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1980).

[3]See Appendix II for the Pearson correlation coefficients and significance levels between the independent time, subject, era, and age variables and the dependent evaluative categories. Included in the endnotes are mean averages, and pertinent significant tests for the SCSS "XTAB" and "BREAKDOWN" procedures.

[4]XTAB: D50 by PDESIGN, Chi. Sq. = 12.181; Sig. = .000; DF = 1.

[5]XTAB: D50 by PNOTES, Chi. Sq. = 3.588; Sig. = .058; DF = 1; D50 by CONTRIBUTION, Chi. Sq. = 11.196; Sig. = .048; DF = 5.

[6]XTAB: D50 by PINTEREST, Chi. Sq. = 3.715; Sig. = .054; DF = 1.

[7]Fifty-five % of the reviewers devoted over two-thirds of the allotted space to summary, and fifty-four % identified the work as favorable or highly favorable. XTAB: D50 by REPORT, Chi. Sq. = 6.309; Sig. = .043; DF = 2; D50 by ASSESS, Chi. Sq. = 11.260; Sig. = .024; DF = 4.

[8]In the 1960s only forty-seven % of the reviews were primarily summations. The trend toward more critique continued into the seventies and eighties. XTAB: DECADE by REPORT, Chi. Sq. = 10.546; Sig. = .103; DF = 6.

[9]XTAB: D50 by ASSESS. Chi. Sq. = 11.260; Sig. = .024; DF = 4.

[10]XTAB: D60 by PRESEARCH, Chi. Sq. = 4.702; Sig. = .030; DF = 1.

[11]XTAB: D60 by STYLE, Chi. Sq. = 23.299; Sig. = .000; DF = 5.

[12]XTAB: D70 by POMETHOD, Chi. Sq. = 4.301; Sig. = .038; DF = 1.

[13]In the 1970s, only forty-three percent of the reviewers commented on the quality of the research and fourteen percent on the factual accuracies of a book. This is down from fifty-four percent and nineteen percent respectively for the decade of the sixties. XTAB: DECADE by PRESEARCH, Chi. Sq. = 4.912, Sig. = .178, DF = 3; DECADE by PERRORS, Chi. Sq. = 3.530; Sig. = .317, DF = 3.

[14]Seventy-one percent of the comments during the 1970s regarding the use of a quantitative method were positive. In the 1980s, this percentage dropped to only forty-four percent. XTAB: D70 by QUANT, Chi. Sq. = 14.588, Sig. = .012, DF = 5.

[15]Only eight percent of the reviewers of the 1970s criticized the author's literary style, as opposed to eighteen percent in the preceding decade. Similarly, seventeen percent commented on the enjoyability of the historical work in the 1970s, down from thirty percent in the 1950s. XTAB: DECADE by STYLE, Chi. Sq. = 38.615, Sig. = .001, DF = 15; DECADE by PINTEREST, Chi. Sq. = 8.064, Sig. = .045, DF = 3.

[16]XTAB: DECADE by QUANT. Chi. Sq. = 32.565; Sig. = .005; DF = 15.

[17]XTAB: D80 by PTHESIS, Chi. Sq. = 4.690; Sig. = .030; DF = 1; D80 by PANALYSIS, Chi. Sq. = 7.351; Sig. = .007; DF = 1.

[18]Before 1975, fifty-five percent of the complaints were that the book was too short, as compared with eleven percent since 1975. Few reviewers, however, commented about the appropriateness of the length. XTAB: SINCE75 by SIZE, Chi. Sq. = 5.452, Sig. = .142, DF = 3.

[19]Note that only three of the major evaluative categories failed to pass a significance test for change in usage for at least some period in the past thirty years. See Appendix II.

[20]The mean overall assessment for each of the subject categories were as follows: Military (n = 55) 3.509; Political (n = 144) 3.543; Social (n = 149) 3.550; Diplomatic (n = 3.500); Minority (n = 62) 3.419; Economic (n = 71) 3.746; Religion (n = 42)3.500; Urban (n = 29) 3.931; Intellectual (n = 40) 3.625.

[21]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: BIAS by POL, F = 26.8150, Sig. = .0000.

[22]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: OMETHOB by DIPLO, F = .9552, Sign. = .3288; CONTRIBU by DIPLO, F = 4.5334, Sig. = .0337.

[23]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: RESEARCH by SOC, F = 4.0031, Sig. = .0459; OMETHOB by SOC, F = 3.5287, Sig. = .0608; INTEREST by SOC, F = 6.2500, Sig. = .0127.

[24]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: ANALYSIS by MIN, F = 2.9033, Sig. = .0890.

[25]The mean overall assessments for each of the historic periods were as follows: COL (n = 54) 3.593; REV (n = 52) 3.288; EARLY (n = 65) 3.708; MIDDLE (n = 93) 3.699; CIVIL (n = 95) 3.621; GILDED (n = 72) 3.690; PROG (n = 87) 3.563; WARS (n = 83) 3.482; RECENT (n = 68) 3.279. SURVEY (n = 107) 3.598. Total (n = 536) 3.543.

[26]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: RESEARCH by GILDED, F = 4.0682, Sig. = .0442; INTEREST by GILDED, F = 4.5381, Sig. = .0336.

[27]The mean overall assessment for Civil War books reviewed between 1961 and 1967 was 3.185, as opposed to a mean of assessment of 3.794 for Civil War works reviewed in other years. BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: ASSESS by CEN (Centennial Civil War Books), F = 5.9937, Sig. = .0162.

[28]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: F = 2.9138, Sig. = .0884.

[29]Five of the eight reviewers of Revolutionary books who discussed the persuasiveness of the author's interpretation remained unconvinced.

[30]The lower rating was significant. BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: ASSESS by RECENT, F = 4.2364, Sig. = .0401.

[31]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: RESEARCH by RECENT, F = 4.2998, Sig. = .0386.

[32]Before 1970, the mean rating for contribution to field was 2.589 for monographs and 3.075 for biographies. After 1970, there was no significant difference in mean rating between monographs and biographies.

[33]The mean overall assessments for the following genre of publications were as follows: Monographs (n = 334) 3.536; Biographies (n = 114) 3.535; Reader (n = 77) 3.235; Other (n = 64) 3.703. BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: ASSESS by TYPE, F = .9352, Sig. = .4868.

[34]XTAB: PANALYSIS by R (Reviewers by era of birth), Chi. Sq. = 18.892, Sig. = .000, DF = 3; PTHESIS by R, Chi. Sq. = 6.483, Sig. = .090, DF = 3; POMETH by R, Chi. Sq. = 20.745, Sig. = .000, DF = 3; PDESIGN by R, Chi. Sq. = 16.968, Sig. = .001, DF = 3; PEXTRA by R, Chi. Sq. = 3.883, Sig. = .274, DF = 3.

[35]XTAB: ASSESS by R, Chi. Sq. = 26.213, Sig. = .010, DF = 12.

[36]BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: ASSESS by ERA by SP (Reviewers born before 1920), F (LINEARITY) = 5.0285, Sig. = .0253.

[37]BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: INTEREST by ASP (Authors born before 1920), F = 6.2198, Sig. = .0129.

[38]The mean assessment among Senior reviewers toward authors born before 1920 was 4.322, but only 3.500 for authors born since 1920. BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: ASSESS by A (Author's era of birth) by Senior (pre-1900 Reviewers), F (LINEARITY) = 2.1984, Sig. = .1389.

[39]In the 1950s, the mean rating of Progressive Reviewers toward Progressive authors was 3.818, while their rating of non-Progressive authors was 4.106. For the entire thirty year period, the percent of favorable reviews of Progressive reviewers toward authors born before 1920 was fifty-five percent, significantly below the seventy percent of favorable reviews they awarded to authors born since 1920. XTAB: FASS (Favorable reviews) by ASP (pre-1920 authors) by Progressive, Chi. Sq. = 3.547, Sig. = .060, DF = 1.

[40]XTAB: FASS by SINCE75 by DEPRESSION, Chi. Sq. = 1.795, Sig. = .180, DF = 1.

[41]The mean assessment of Depression reviews toward Depression authors was 3.556, as opposed to 3.309 for non-Depression authors. BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: ASSESS by ADEP (Depression authors) by DEPRESSION, Depression Independent, F = 3.8841, Sig. = .0493.

[42]The mean assessments of Recent reviewers was 3.444 for authors born before 1920 and 2.750 to those born since 1940.

[43]The mean rating of Progressive and Recent reviewers was 4.000 for biographies and 3.541 for monographs, a statistically significant variance. BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA; PR Independent: ASSESS by MONOBIO (monograph vs. biography) by PR (Progressive and Recent reviewers), F = 3.0138, Sig. = .0832. For Depression reviewers, the ratings were 3.500 for monographs and 3.167 for biographies, also a significant difference. F = 2.9488, Sig. = .0866.

[44]XTAB: PR (Progressive and Recent Reviewers) by PTHESIS, Chi. Sq. = 1.598, Sig. = .206, DF = 1; PR by POMETHOD, Chi. Sq. = 9.782, Sig. = .002, DF = 1.

[45]XTAB: R35 by REPORT, Chi. Sq. = 7.011, Sig. = .030, DF = 2; R35 by PERROR, Chi. Sq. = 7.899, Sig. = .005, DF = 1; R35 by PANALYSIS, Chi. Sq. = 11.639, Sig. = .001, DF = 1; R35 by POSUB,Chi. Sq. = 2.857, Sig. = .091, DF = 1; R35 by PSTYLE, Chi. Sq. = 3.235, Sig. = .072, DF = 1.

[46]XTAB: R3545 by ASSESS, Chi. Sq. = 11.855, Sig. = .018, DF = 4; R3545 by POMETHOD, Chi. Sq. = 3.057, Sig. = .080, DF = 1; R3545 by POSUB, Chi. Sq. = 2.336, Sig. = .126, DF = 1; R3545 by PANALYSIS, Chi. Sq. = 7.121, Sig. = .008, DF = 1.

[47]XTAB: R4555 by REPORT, Chi. Sq. = 4.359, Sig. = .113, DF = 3. R4555 by PERRORS, Chi. Sq. = 1.837, Sig. = .175, DF = 1;R4555 by PRESEARCH, Chi. Sq. = 3.050, Sig. = .081, DF = 1.

[48]XTAB: R5565 by ASSESS, Chi. Sq. = 7.018, Sig. = .135, DF = 4; R5565 by PANALYSIS, Chi. Sq. = 3.648, Sig. = .056, DF = 1; R5565 by RESEARCH, Chi. Sq. = 6.156, Sig. = .291, DF = 5; R5565 by PEXTRAS, Chi. Sq. = 1.783, Sig. = .182, DF = 1; R5565 by BALANCE, Chi. Sq. = 9.448, Sig.= .092, DF = 5.

[49]XTAB: R65UP by ASSESS, Chi. Sq. = 9.060, Sig. = .060, DF = 4; R65UP by PANALYSIS, Chi. Sq. = 4.214, Sig. = .040, DF = 1; R65UP by PBIAS, Chi. Sq. = 3.740, Sig. = .053, DF = 1.

[50]The mean assessments were 3.875, 3.621, and 3.455 for books reviewed by reviewers fifteen or more years senior, by reviewers within fifteen years of age with the author, and by reviewers fifteen years younger than authors. BREAKDOWN: F (LINEARITY) = 4.5080, Sig. = .0345.

[51]BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: AAGE (Author's age) by RESEARCH, F (LINEARITY) = 6.4795, Sig. = .0013.

[52]The mean assessments were 3.488 for reviewers from large state or prestigious private schools, and 3.630 for reviewers from small state and small private schools. BREAKDOWN, Oneway ANOVA: F = 1.5437, Sig. = .2090.

[53]BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: ASSESS by STATE, F (LINEARITY) = 1.2368, Sig. = .2667.

[54]The mean assessment was 3.714 for reviewers from southwestern institutions, a figure slightly above the overall average rating of 3.542. BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: ASSESS by REGION, F (LINEARITY) = 1.2175, Sig. = .2704. The mean rating for contribution to field was 3.277 for reviewers from mid-western institutions, above the overall rating of 2.731. BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: CONTRIBU by REGION, F (DEVIATION) = 2.3757, Sig. = .0213.

[55]The mean assessment for the combined sample of 313 books from major and minor university presses was 3.676. The mean assessment for the 186 books from commercial presses was only 3.339.

[56]There was,however, a significant correlation between the cost of the book (in 1967 dollars) and time. Books published in the late sixties and early seventies were more expensive in real dollars than books published in other years. BREAKDOWN, Text of Linearity: CCP (cost in 1967 dollars) by ERA, F (DEVIATION) = 2.8731, Sig. = .0143.

[57]For Pearson correlation coefficients, see Appendix II.

[58]BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: AAGE (Author's Age) by ERA, F (LINEARITY) = 3.4762, Sig. = .0630.

[59]The mean age among Revolutionary authors was fifty-three years, as opposed to only forty-two years for Gilded Age authors. BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: AAGE by PERIOD1, F (LINEARITY) 8.1215, Sig. = .0046. The average age was forty-eight years for biographers, forty-six and one-half years for authors of monographs, and fifty-four years for editors of multi-authored readers. BREAKDOWN, Text of Linearity: AAGE by TYPE, F (DEVIATION) = 1.4836, Sig. = .1712.

[60]BREAKDOWN, Test of Linearity: RAGE (Reviewer's Age) by ERA, F (LINEARITY) = .1721, Sig. = .6785, F (DEVIATION) = .5740, Sig. = .7200; RAGE by SUB1, F (DEVIATION) = 1.6997, Sig. = .0961; XTAB: ERA by RANKSCH, Chi. Sq. = 61.346, Sig. = .001, DF = 30; ERA by RANKPUB, Chi. Sq. = 73.591, Sig. = .000, DF = 30.

[61]XTAB: ERA by FEMALER (female reviewers), Chi. Sq. = 18.368, Sig. = .005, DF = 6; ERA by FEMALEA, Chi. Sq. = 7.227 Sig. = .300;DF = 6.

VARIABLE NAME, LABEL AND CODE

NAME	LABEL	CODE
REPORT	RATIO SUMMARY TO CRITIQUE	1) Mostly summary; 2) Half and half; 3) Mostly critique
ASSESS	OVERALL RATING	1) Highly unfavorable; 2) Unfavorable; 3) Mixed; 4) Favorable with quibbles; 5) Highly favorable
CONTRIBU	VALUE TO FIELD	1) None; 2) Adds little; 3) Mixed; 4) Notable, significant; 5) Best; definitive
INTEREST	ENJOYABILITY OF NARRATIVE	1) Uninspiring; 3) Mixed; 4) Interesting; 5) Superlative
RESEARCH	COMPLETENESS OF RESEARCH	1) Incomplete; 2) Omits some sources; 3) Satisfactory, mixed; 4) Good use of sources, careful; 5) Superlative
ERRORS	FACTUAL ACCURACY	1) Numerous errors; 2) Some errors; 3) Mixed; 4) Accurate, error free; 5) Superlative
BALANCE	SELECTIVITY OF MATERIAL INCLUDED	1) Poor; 2) Needs more of/less of; 3) Mixed; 4) Well-balanced; 5) Superlative
NOTES	QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	1) Poor, inadequate; 2) Wrong location; 3) Mixed, satisfactory; 4) Good, correct location; 5) Superlative
DESIGN	ATTRACTIVENESS OF COVER/LAYOUT	1) Poor; 3) Satisfactory; 4) Good; 5) Superlative
EXTRAS	QUALITY OF CHARTS/ MAPS/ILLUSTRATIONS	1) Poor quality; 2) Needs more of; 3) Satisfactory; 4) Good; 5) Superlative
BIAS	OBJECTIVITY OF AUTHOR	1) Biased; 2) Too laudatory treatment; 3) Mixed; 4) Unbiased; 5) Superlative
INTERPRET	PERSUASIVENESS OF INTERPRETATION	1) Unpersuasive; 3) Mixed; 4) Agrees with interpretation; 5) Superlative
OSUB	ORIGINALITY OF SUBJECT	1) Area overworked; 2) Adds little; 3) Mixed; 4) Fresh return to old subject; 5) Timely, first time covered
OMETHOD	ORIGINALITY OF METHOD	1) Old fashioned; 2) Needs method/model of other disciplines; 3) Mixed; 4) Innovative; 5) Superlative
QUANT	USE OF QUANTITATIVE METHOD	1) Lack of/needed more of; 2) Poorly done; 3) Mixed; 4) Good; 5) Superlative

ANALYSIS	QUALITY OF ANALYSIS	1) Poor, superficial; 2) Too descriptive needs more; 3) Mixed; 4) Good; 5) Superlative
THESIS	UNITY OF THESIS	1) No/unclear thesis; 2) Unproven; 3) Satisfactory; 4) Clear/coherent thesis; 5) Superlative
STYLE	LITERARY STYLE	1) Unreadable, grammatical problems; 3) Mixed; 4) Well-written; 5) Superlative
CLARITY	LITERARY CLARITY	1) Too technical; poor definition; 3) Mixed; 4) Well-written; 5) Superlative
EDITOR	QUALITY OF EDITING	1) Misspellings/typos; 2) Uneven quality; needs more editing; 3) Satisfactory; 4) Good; 5) Superlative
TITLE	APPROPRIATENESS OF TITLE	1) Misleading; 2) More than title suggests; 3) Mixed; 4) Good; 5) Superlative
AUDIENCE	READERSHIP OF WORK	1) No audience; 2) Only specialists; 3) Only popular; 4) Specialists and general; 5) Superlative
SCOPE	APPROPRIATENESS OF SUBJECT	1) Too broad; 2) Too narrow; 3) Mixed; 4) Good; 5) Superlative
SIZE	APPROPRIATENESS OF LENGTH	1) Too long; 2) Too short; 3) Mixed; 4) Good; 5) Superlative

APPENDIX II
DECADE AND BOOK TYPE BY EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES

CORRELATION
SIGNIFICANCE: * .050 ** .010 *** .001

	REPORT	ASSESS	PCONTRIB	CONTRIBU	PINTERES	INTEREST
ERA	.109**	-.097*	.107**	.067	-.035	-.032
D50	-.095*	.119**	-.093*	-.038	.081*	.089*
D60	.007	-.044	.032	-.002	.008	-.004
D70	.036	-.024	-.031	-.030	-.112**	-.107**
D80	.064	-.065	.119**	.092*	.029	.029
MONO	.048	-.008	-.070*	-.047	.024	.029
BIO	.101**	-.004	.056	.064	.029	.029
READER	-.098*	-.049	-.030	-.032	-.025	-.019

	PRESEARC	RESEARCH	PERRORS	ERRORS	PBALANCE	BALANCE
ERA	-.036	-.071*	-.052	-.102**	.055	-.024
D50	-.019	.020	.008	.069	-.058	.003
D60	.092*	.072*	.063	.021	.040	.052
D70	-.051	-.048	-.025	-.031	-.042	-.068
D80	-.028	-.057	-.059	-.077*	.078*	.017
MONO	.072*	.081*	.059	.004	.072*	.036
BIO	.104**	.087*	-.018	.031	.046	.047
READER	-.092*	-.090*	-.031	-.028	-.039	.008

	PNOTES	NOTES	PDESIGN	DESIGN	PEXTRAS	EXTRAS
ERA	-.095*	-.040	-.164***	-.162***	-.002	-.005
D50	.080*	.047	.147***	.145***	-.006	-.003
D60	-.002	-.032	-.012	-.003	-.006	-.006
D70	-.013	.023	-.042	-.053	.077*	.069
D80	-.084*	-.049	-.121**	-.115**	-.084*	-.078*
MONO	-.092*	-.103**	-.117**	-.124**	-.042	-.094*
BIO	.037	.012	.029	.031	-.029	.000
READER	-.049	-.056	-.024	-.046	.006	.017

	PBIAS	BIAS	PINTERPR	INTERPRE	POSUB	OSUB
ERA	-.015	-.053	.024	-.016	.010	.020
D50	.007	.038	-.059	-.010	-.040	-.043
D60	.017	.034	.075*	.075*	.046	.034
D70	-.022	-.053	-.019	-.043	-.018	-.002
D80	-.002	-.025	.005	-.028	.016	.015
MONO	-.051	-.044	.010	.044	.007	.034
BIO	.155***	.170***	.029	-.012	.066	.063
READER	-.034	-.058	-.033	-.035	-.035	-.041

	POMETHOD	OMETHOD	PQUANT	QUANT	PANALYSI	ANALYSIS
ERA	.202***	.206***	.116**	.106**	.105**	.049
D50	-.142***	-.137***	-.078*	-.077*	-.067	-.040
D60	-.066	-.086*	-.061	-.054	-.033	-.010
D70	.088*	.117**	.071*	.086*	.011	.029
D80	.156***	.136***	.089*	.059	.115**	.027
MONO	.097*	.117**	.125**	.108**	.079*	.075*
BIO	.010	-.023	-.129**	-.122*	.050	.048
READER	-.038	-.026	.068	.086*	-.042	-.041

	PTHESIS	THESIS	PSTYLE	STYLE	PCLARITY	CLARITY
ERA	.102**	.075*	.020	.005	.002	-.055
D50	-.098*	-.052	-.061	-.010	.029	.078*
D60	.039	.010	.114**	.057	-.021	-.027
D70	-.012	-.017	-.038	-.039	-.031	-.048
D80	.092*	.076*	-.019	-.010	.031	-.004
MONO	.125**	.090*	.097*	.110**	.112**	.068
BIO	-.051	.006	.070*	.067	-.027	-.010
READER	-.051	-.057	-.117**	-.119**	-.026	-.011

APPENDIX III
SUBJECT AND PERIOD BY EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES

CORRELATION SIGNIFICANCE: * .050 ** .010 *** .001

	REPORT	ASSESS	CONTRIBU	INTEREST	RESEARCH	ERRORS
DIPLO	-.013	-.011	-.090*	-.031	-.044	-.037
POL	.054	-.075*	-.004	-.073*	.044	.009
ECO	-.023	.070	-.027	-.032	-.031	.033
SOC	.027	.004	-.014	.105**	.084*	-.019
INT	-.025	.021	.026	.102**	.008	-.033
MIL	.075*	-.010	-.039	.009	-.021	.035
URBAN	.012	.082*	-.010	-.007	.046	.024
REL	-.021	-.011	.028	-.018	-.022	-.037
MIN	.023	-.039	.063	-.021	-.011	-.039
COL	.061	.015	.017	.012	.053	-.004
REV	.067	-.074*	-.063	-.028	.036	.025
EARLY	-.045	.054	-.006	.060	.063	.101**
MIDDLE	-.029	.063	.084*	.042	.002	.030
CIVIL	.014	.032	.050	.033	.015	.023
GILDED	-.023	.051	.049	.090*	.085*	-.047
PROG	-.076*	.008	-.005	.004	.054	.017
WARS	-.043	-.023	-.101**	-.039	-.045	-.061
RECENT	.008	-.089*	-.060	-.010	-.087*	-.002
SURVEY	.050	.024	.043	.001	-.014	-.024

	NOTES	DESIGN	EXTRAS	BIAS	INTERPRE	OSUB
DIPLO	.016	-.056	-.012	.014	.080*	-.081*
POL	-.060	-.035	-.077*	.214***	-.040	.012
ECO	-.007	-.004	.034	-.032	-.019	-.017
SOC	.064	-.016	.046	-.041	-.008	.015
INT	.027	-.067	-.088*	-.106**	-.005	.007
MIL	.034	.106**	.087*	-.000	.030	.024
URBAN	-.061	-.034	-.001	-.045	-.006	.000
REL	.022	-.056	.008	.047	.069	.038
MIN	-.032	-.043	-.045	-.011	-.052	.007
COL	.074*	.008	.021	.015	-.019	.049
REV	-.005	.016	-.016	.012	.081*	.011
EARLY	-.007	.102**	.007	.066	.006	-.028
MIDDLE	.044	.111**	.051	.014	.015	-.053
CIVIL	.019	.119**	.059	.002	-.053	-.014
GILDED	.022	.049	.076*	.047	-.001	-.001
PROG	-.067	-.061	-.033	-.005	-.031	.001
WARS	-.050	-.063	-.047	.033	-.037	.056
RECENT	-.051	-.070*	-.086*	.050	.010	.031
SURVEY	-.045	-.075*	.003	-.087*	-.039	-.005

	METHOD	QUANT	ANALYSIS	THESIS	STYLE	CLARITY
DIPLO	-.041	-.015	.026	-.037	-.011	.007
POL	.049	-.060	.089*	-.003	-.001	.112**
ECO	.017	.057	.011	-.028	.075*	-.000
SOC	.079*	.063	.003	-.059	.025	-.020
INT	-.031	-.036	.075*	-.001	-.050	.009
MIL	-.074*	-.026	-.017	-.051	.033	.035
URBAN	.044	.115**	-.053	.126**	-.063	-.003
REL	.031	-.031	-.004	-.009	-.045	-.002
MIN	.145***	.056	-.072*	-.028	-.043	.011
COL	-.040	-.013	-.024	-.002	-.029	-.051
REV	-.032	-.053	-.014	-.055	-.015	-.080*
EARLY	-.021	.002	-.046	-.048	-.058	-.083*
MIDDLE	.010	.061	-.035	-.017	.012	-.024
CIVIL	.037	.042	-.013	-.084*	.074*	-.038
GILDED	.061	.040	-.051	-.045	.007	-.030
PROG	-.018	-.025	-.012	-.036	-.043	-.017
WARS	-.017	-.011	.080*	-.035	-.008	-.026
RECENT	.058	.016	.046	-.038	-.029	-.019
SURVEY	-.002	.006	.012	-.034	.006	.015

APPENDIX IV
ERA OF BIRTH BY EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES

CORRELATION
SIGNIFICANCE: * .050 ** .010 *** .001

	REPORT	ASSESS	PCONTRIB	CONTRIBU	PINTERES	INTEREST
R	.128**	-.188***	.063	.018	-.021	-.027
SENIOR	-.060	.160***	.001	.038	.015	.036
PROGRESS	-.113**	.096*	-.033	-.009	.006	-.007
DEPRESSI	.087*	-.085*	.010	-.027	-.008	-.004
POST40	.041	-.053	.089*	.081*	-.010	-.007
A	.069	-.073	.003	-.030	-.117**	-.127**
ASENIOR	-.038	-.042	.053	.032	.042	.052
APROG	-.022	.053	-.043	-.020	.067	.058
ADEPRESS	-.005	.030	-.025	-.020	-.083*	-.080*
APOST40	.123**	-.076*	.026	.014	-.048	-.056

	PRESEARC	RESEARCH	PERRORS	ERRORS	PBALANCE	BALANCE
R	.022	-.035	.021	-.033	.031	-.079*
SENIOR	.011	.050	-.008	.030	.017	.095*
PROGRESS	-.018	.010	-.026	.009	-.080*	-.046
DEPRESSI	-.025	-.051	.027	-.004	.020	-.018
POST40	.052	.024	-.006	-.018	.009	-.053
A	.023	.005	-.040	-.061	.104*	.028
ASENIOR	-.064	-.078*	-.016	-.037	-.064	-.071*
APROG	.006	.023	.031	.078*	-.020	.032
ADEPRESS	.050	.057	.001	-.007	.019	.020
APOST40	.015	-.002	-.030	-.061	.124**	.037

	PNOTES	NOTES	PDESIGN	DESIGN	PEXTRAS	EXTRAS
R	-.060	-.056	-.168***	-.165***	-.069	-.109**
SENIOR	.047	.042	.141***	.143***	.004	.032
PROGRESS	.046	.061	-.008	-.014	.027	.042
DEPRESSI	-.060	-.061	-.083*	-.081*	-.026	-.059
POST40	.008	.017	-.076*	-.072*	-.082*	-.086*
A	-.087*	-.047	-.109*	-.106*	.013	.015
ASENIOR	.057	.034	.049	.057	.007	-.010
APROG	.001	.011	.038	.029	-.027	-.006
ADEPRESS	-.027	-.018	-.046	-.047	.044	.037
APOST40	-.059	-.051	-.077*	-.074*	-.046	-.038

	PBIAS	BIAS	PINTERPR	INTERPRE	POSUB	OSUB
R	.002	-.040	.032	.000	.070	.078*
SENIOR	-.008	.009	-.080*	-.069	-.049	-.051
PROGRESS	-.017	.020	.020	.039	-.043	-.045
DEPRESSI	.010	-.019	.047	-.004	.029	.020
POST40	-.009	-.023	-.059	-.054	.028	.033
A	.035	.002	.084*	.058	.013	.028
ASENIOR	-.017	-.058	-.045	-.024	-.022	-.055
APROG	-.034	.000	-.053	-.029	-.071*	-.060
ADEPRESS	.019	.053	.077*	.056	.100**	.131***
APOST40	.058	.011	.038	-.006	-.016	-.031

	POMETHOD	OMETHOD	PQUANT	QUANT	PANALYSI	ANALYSIS
R	.173***	.158***	.086*	.058	.191***	.144***
SENIOR	-.066	-.056	-.026	-.015	-.070*	-.045
PROGRESS	-.153***	-.131***	-.080*	-.062	-.116**	-.091*
DEPRESSI	.164***	.155***	.060	.067	.098*	.119**
POST40	.030	.034	.027	-.001	.131***	.087*
A	.156***	.177***	.056	.064	.107*	.092*
ASENIOR	-.005	-.026	.000	.005	-.116**	-.126**
APROG	-.086*	-.077*	-.001	-.013	.040	.034
ADEPRESS	.038	.028	-.044	-.050	.004	.043
APOST40	.098*	.139***	.086*	.109**	.140***	.093*

	PTHESIS	THESIS	PSTYLE	STYLE	PCLARITY	CLARITY
R	.089*	.059	-.012	-.035	.058	.018
SENIOR	-.098*	-.074*	.034	.064	-.056	-.035
PROGRESS	-.049	-.034	.001	.001	.007	.020
DEPRESSI	.058	.064	.021	.011	.010	.002
POST40	-.013	-.038	.011	.010	.041	.011
A	.085*	.107*	-.050	-.040	-.004	-.052
ASENIOR	-.032	-.062	-.007	-.017	-.089*	-.079*
APROG	-.053	-.045	.005	.006	.086*	.107**
ADEPRESS	.053	.071*	.030	.039	.005	-.010
APOST40	.061	.068	-.054	-.053	.000	-.030

APPENDIX V
AGE AND SEX BY EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES

CORRELATION
SIGNIFICANCE: * .050 ** .010 *** .001

	REPORT	ASSESS	PCONTRIB	CONTRIBU	PINTERES	INTEREST
RAGE	-.095*	.184***	-.020	.024	-.011	.003
R35	.118**	-.030	.074	.055	-.049	-.035
R3545	.074	-.144**	.025	-.016	.024	.014
R4555	-.095*	.007	-.050	-.021	.035	.017
R5565	-.064	.111**	-.046	-.041	-.018	-.006
R65UP	.010	.125**	.038	.077*	-.032	-.013
AAGE	.008	.008	.095*	.075	.084*	.100*
DIFFAGE	.081	-.123*	.090*	.043	.043	.050
FEMALEA	-.020	-.010	-.013	-.010	.002	.003

	PRESEARC	RESEARCH	PERRORS	ERRORS	PBALANCE	BALANCE
RAGE	-.017	.032	-.094*	-.073	.002	.071
R35	.075	.038	.130**	.137**	-.014	-.039
R3545	.028	-.014	.024	-.003	.059	.009
R4555	-.080*	-.053	-.062	-.087*	-.022	-.003
R5565	.015	.048	-.002	.057	-.102*	-.082*
R65UP	-.008	.012	-.064	-.066	.100*	.157***
AAGE	-.111*	-.122**	.027	.008	-.103*	-.062
DIFFAGE	-.064	-.112*	.095*	.076	-.088*	-.093*
FEMALEA	-.062	-.064	-.018	-.007	-.002	.018

	PNOTES	NOTES	PDESIGN	DESIGN	PEXTRAS	EXTRAS
RAGE	.005	.014	.070	.071	.081*	.133**
R35	.031	.023	-.016	-.008	-.063	-.071
R3545	-.067	-.046	-.042	-.037	-.028	-.081*
R4555	-.005	-.036	.009	-.004	-.008	.000
R5565	.118**	.137**	.015	-.001	.062	.099*
R65UP	-.079*	-.081*	.058	.090*	.040	.078*
AAGE	.012	.021	.027	.027	.001	.010
DIFFAGE	.057	.038	-.008	-.005	-.012	-.032
FEMALEA	-.036	-.028	-.006	-.001	-.006	.004

	PBIAS	BIAS	PINTERPR	INTERPRE	POSUB	OSUB
RAGE	-.018	.000	-.052	-.029	-.112**	-.091*
R35	-.011	-.035	-.008	.016	.078*	.085*
R3545	.048	.045	.043	.014	.070	.042
R4555	-.027	-.025	.007	-.003	-.048	-.053
R5565	-.078*	-.058	-.040	-.002	-.055	-.024
R65UP	.089*	.086*	-.026	-.036	-.044	-.037
AAGE	-.059	-.048	-.077	-.090*	-.020	-.046
DIFFAGE	-.042	-.045	-.009	-.035	.044	-.011
FEMALEA	-.006	-.013	-.085*	-.042	-.075*	-.072*

	POMETHOD	OMETHOD	PQUANT	QUANT	PANALYSI	ANALYSIS
RAGE	-.110**	-.080*	-.050	-.033	-.211***	-.191***
R35	.060	.035	.000	.000	.157***	.159***
R3545	.081*	.078*	.039	.028	.123**	.086*
R4555	-.036	-.044	-.006	-.011	-.093*	-.069
R5565	-.057	-.041	-.023	-.009	-.088*	-.076*
R65UP	-.064	-.043	-.029	-.022	-.095*	-.089*
AAGE	-.072	-.098*	-.038	-.042	-.027	-.073
DIFFAGE	.023	-.016	.043	.029	.131**	.064
FEMALEA	.105**	.101**	.020	-.006	-.056	-.048

	PTHESIS	THESIS	PSTYLE	STYLE	PCLARITY	CLARITY
RAGE	-.039	-.024	.023	.038	-.047	-.052
R35	-.008	.017	.083*	.034	.042	.015
R3545	.050	.011	-.058	-.037	-.013	.014
R4555	-.004	.008	-.036	-.036	.039	.050
R5565	-.036	-.026	.038	.039	-.044	-.082*
R65UP	-.024	-.015	.033	.042	-.024	-.007
AAGE	-.009	-.069	.036	.012	-.075	-.043
DIFFAGE	.040	-.003	-.008	-.036	-.036	.008
FEMALEA	.008	.006	-.088*	-.061	.010	.000

APPENDIX VI
BREAKDOWN OF AGE, PAGE, COST AND ASSESSMENT BY DECADE, TYPE, SUBJECT AND PUBLISHER

DECADE	AGE OF REVIEWER	AGE OF AUTHOR	PAGES	COST IN 1967 DOLLARS	ASSESSMENT
1950s	48.5	46.8	356	$6.92	3.757
1960s	47.0	46.6	345	8.08	3.465
1970s	47.9	49.2	311	7.45	3.500
1980s	47.3	50.6	326	7.23	3.367
TYPE					
BIC	48.7	47.9	365	8.27	3.535
MONO	47.3	46.6	319	7.01	3.536
READER	51.2	54.1	342	6.54	3.235
SUBJECT					
DIPLO	48.2	47.5	351	7.31	3.500
POL	45.7	45.5	356	7.62	3.403
ECO	49.3	47.5	359	7.48	3.746
SOC	47.8	49.4	328	6.96	3.550
INT	47.2	43.8	340	7.68	3.625
MIL	47.2	50.2	361	7.55	3.509
URBAN	50.2	45.1	308	6.92	3.931
REL	49.5	49.2	353	8.19	3.500
MIN	46.2	49.8	321	7.63	3.419
COL	48.3	47.3	340	8.04	3.593
REV	45.4	51.0	336	7.46	3.288
EARLY	48.1	49.5	346	8.16	3.708
MIDDLE	48.5	47.4	313	7.94	3.699
CIVIL	47.3	47.0	331	7.54	3.621
GILDED	49.9	44.6	318	7.41	3.690
PROG	48.9	45.9	345	8.37	3.563
WARS	47.1	45.0	367	8.17	3.482
RECENT	47.8	45.6	331	7.00	3.279
SURVEY	47.7	50.4	343	6.71	3.598
TYPE OF PUBLISHER					
MAJOR UNIVERSITY	47.4	44.1	325	7.41	3.717
MINOR UNIVERSITY	47.9	49.0	288	8.03	3.548
MAJOR COMMERCIAL	47.9	53.9	379	7.46	3.340
MINOR COMMERCIAL	48.0	52.2	341	7.66	3.338
HISTORICAL SOCIETIES	52.6	49.2	340	6.33	3.696
GOVERNMENT	42.8	48.3	410	5.97	3.000
MEAN AVERAGES	47.7	47.9	335	7.45	3.543